DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 032 CS 505 478

AUTHOR Allen, Jerry L.; And Others
TITLE Communication Competence, Anxiety, Avoidance Behaviors, and the Classroom Experiences of Nonnative English Speakers in the U.S.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Communication Apprehension; Communication Research; *Communicative Competence (Languages); Educationally Disadvantaged; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Interpersonal Communication; Learning Processes; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Teacher Student Relationship; Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS Nonnative Speakers; *Personal Report of Communication Apprehension

ABSTRACT

A study considered whether nonnative English-speaking students are educationally handicapped in American classrooms by their communication competence (CC) and/or communication apprehension (CA). Affective, cognitive, and behavioral learning outcomes of 298 international college students' CA, immediacy (degree of perceived physical or psychological closeness between communicators), and self-reported CC were determined using two versions of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension. Results indicated strong correlations between (1) CA in students' native language and CA in English, (2) immediacy with American students and immediacy with instructors, and (3) CA in English and self-perceptions of competency when communicating in English. Analyses revealed a modest relation between students' CA and their immediacy with Americans in general. Findings also showed that CA and immediacy are generalized by students in both their native language and English. In addition, a significant correlation was found between CA in students' native language and competency in that language, between CA in English and affect for the instructor, and between CA and behavior intent. However, CA was not significantly correlated with other affective, cognitive, and behavioral learning outcomes. Nor were competence or immediacy in English found to be significantly related to learning outcomes. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED279032

COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE, ANXIETY, AVOIDANCE BEHAVIORS, AND THE CLASSROOM EXPERIENCES OF NONNATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS IN THE U.S.

Jerry L. Allen
Littlefield Professor
University of Bridgeport
Bridgeport, CT 06601

Joan O'Mara
Assistant Professor
University of Bridgeport
Bridgeport, CT 06601

Kathleen M. Long
Assistant Professor
University of New Haven
New Haven, CT 06476

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerry L. Allen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to the Commission on Communication Apprehension and Avoidance at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, 1986.

CS505478

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE, ANXIETY, AVOIDANCE BEHAVIORS, AND THE CLASSROOM EXPERIENCES OF NONNATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS IN THE U.S.

Bring us your tired dreams
  and we'll make them strong
Bring us your foreign songs,
  and we'll sing along.
Leave us your broken dreams,
  and we'll give them time to mend.
Still a lot of love,
  Living in the promise land.
(Willie Nelson, Living in the Promise Land)

The words of the popular song sung by Willie Nelson emphasize the theme that the United States is a "melting pot" where cultural diversity is understood and encouraged; friendship and warmth are extended to all regardless of ethnic background; and each, regardless of heritage, is afforded the opportunity, even helped, to realize his/her dreams and potential. The image is one of an American people who are highly "immediate"--comfortable, relaxed, and pleased--when in the presence of those from other countries. This is not, however, the situation encountered by the more than 300,000 international students studying in U.S. colleges and universities, according to a report by the Institute of International Education. Faculty frequently criticized international students' lack of language proficiency, deficient communication skills, reticence in the classroom, and cliquish social behavior. While Americans ideally profess to being unbiased and tolerant of cultural differences, in actuality intercultural relationships in the U.S are marred by suspicion and lack of understanding caused to a large extent by the judgment that nonnative English speakers are ineffective communicators--both verbally and nonverbally--when interacting

with U.S. educators, students, and citizens generally (Goodwin & Nacht, 1983). The general purpose of the study reported here was to determine if nonnative English speakers are handicapped educationally by either their competence in communication or tendencies to avoid verbal or nonverbal interaction. Specifically, the relationships among CA, nonverbal immediacy, communication competency and the learning (cognitive and affective) and behavior of nonnative English speakers were examined.

RELATED LITERATURE AND RATIONALE

Communication Apprehension

Communication apprehension (CA), "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticapted communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977b; 1984), has been found to be a problem for a major segment of the population of the continental United States. Research indicates that twenty percent of the population is so highly apprehensive that they will avoid oral communication even if they are penalized in personal relationships, educational environments, career attainments, professional relationships and social interactions (Allen, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1984a,b,c; McCroskey, 1977b; 1982; Richmond, 1984; Richmond & McCroskey, 1985).

The majority of the research into communication avoidance--CA and related constructs such as shyness, reticence, and unwillingness to communicate--has been conducted on the general U.S. culture. A recent bibliographical compilation lists over 800 articles and conference papers dealing with communication apprehension and other constructs concerned with communication anxiety and avoidance. Fewer than two dozen of the studies listed were concerned with populations outside of the continental United States (Payne & Richmond, 1984). However, these few studies have involved populations world-wide, and have established that while communication apprehension and avoidance may vary in intensity along cultural lines, the proportion of those who experience discomfort when communicating is high enough to conclude that the general effects of communication apprehension and avoidance--internal discomfort, avoidance, withdrawal, disruption, and over-communication--are pancultural (Klopf, 1984; Richmond & Andriate, 1984; Zimbardo, 1977).

Some recent studies have examined the implications of communication apprehension for bilingual, nonnative communicators. The assumption has been that if CA is a major inhibiting factor in a person's first language, it is probably going to be a controlling factor when it comes to communication avoidance in a second language.

Even though Puerto Rican students are required to study English each year in school, 43 percent report that they are highly apprehensive when communicating in English. Only 11

percent report being highly apprehensive in their first language (Spanish) (Fayer, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1984; McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985). Studies of bilingual, nonnative students studying at universities in the contintental U.S. have revealed similar patterns even though nonnative English speakers' success in the classroom and daily functioning depended upon proficiency and frequent use of English. Verification has been found for the generalizability of CA effects in a first language across a broad spectrum of Asian, European, Latin American, Mexican-American, and Middle Eastern cultures, and CA was more of a problem in the second language (Allen & Andriate, 1984; Allen, O'Mara, & Andriate, 1986; Allen, O'Mara, & Judd, 1985; Appblaum & Trotter, 1986). McCroskey and his associates (McCroskey, Gudykunst, & Nishia, 1985) reported that bilingual Japanese students reported CA in both Japanese and English which was extremely higher than the American norm. As would be expected because the cultural norms do not value talkativeness, apprehension in the native Japanese language was not significantly lower than the apprehension experienced when speaking English.

Based upon these studies the conclusions would be that CA is a broad-based trait which is generalizable across cultures. CA in a second language is usually going to be higher than CA in the native, first language, and, even in those few instances when CA is not significantly higher in the second language, it is not likely to be any lower. This suggests that CA in the dominant, first language determines the baseline for CA in the second language. Those who are highly apprehensive in their first

language will avoid associations and experiences which require the use of a second language, and avoid getting the practice which is necessary to learning a second language (Allen & Andriate, 1984; Allen, et al., 1985; 1986; Fayer, et al., 1984; Krashen, 1981; Lucas, 1984; McCroskey, Gudykunst, & Nishida, 1985; McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985).

With increasing numbers of international students in U.S. colleges and universities, the problems of developing competency and functioning in a second language has become a major concern in higher education. There is no doubt that competency in English as a second language is crucial both to the formation of faculty attitudes and the quality of nonnative U.S. students' learning (Goodwin & Nacht, 1983). It seems obvious, based upon research into the CA experienced by bilingual speakers, that the level of CA in an individual's native language is going to affect the level of CA experienced in the second language, and that the level of communication effectiveness in the second language is strongly influenced by that CA. It is therefore highly likely that high levels of CA are predictive of nonnative English speakers' achievement when functioning in their second language in U.S. classrooms.

Studies of U.S. populations indicate that, though there is little or no relationship to intelligence (Bashore, 1971; McCroskey, Daly, & Sorensen, 1976), those who are highly apprehensive are perceived as less competent in the classroom; do less well on standarized achievement tests; and receive lower

grades. They are less likely to participate in class, receive less attention from the instructor, and are often thought to be slow, lazy, or disinterested (Allen, 1984; McCroskey, 1977a; McCroskey & Andersen, 1976; McCroskey & Daly, 1976; Powers & Smythe, 1980; Scott & Wheeless, 1977). As CA increases, students' attitudes toward school have been found to become more negative, motivation to learn decreases, and final grades are detrimentally affected (Hurt & Preiss, 1978). **The first specific purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which general, traitlike CA affects the learning of nonnative English speakers in U.S. classrooms.**

Nonverbal Immediacy

The avoidance behavior of those who are highly apprehensive connotes negative affect to those with whom they interact and results in the other reciprocating by communicating negative affect in return (Richmond & McCroskey, 1985). Such avoidance behavior is a negative manifestation of a more global construct labeled "nonverbal immediacy." Nonverbal immediacy is the degree of perceived physical or psychological closeness between communicators (Andersen, 1979). Mehrabian (1971) contends that communication behavior patterns can be understood by using the following **immediacy principle**:

> People are drawn toward persons and things they like, evaluate highly, and prefer; and they avoid or move away from things they dislike, evaluate negatively, or do not prefer (p.1).

The most common immediacy behaviors are communicating with another at close proximity, smiling, positive facial affect, eye contact, using direct body orientations, touching, positive body movements and gesturing, and vocal expressiveness (Andersen, 1979).

Behaviorally, those who are immediate use "approach" behaviors such as reducing physical distance, smiling, using appropriate eye contact, and vocal expressiveness. Those who are nonimmediate show "avoidance" by closed body positions, moving away, avoiding eye contact, and negative vocal qualities. Affectively, people are nonverbally immediate with people, situations, and things they like, while being nonverbally nonimmediate wilth people, situations, and things they don't like (e.g., communication)(McCroskey, Richmond, & Stewart, 1986; Richmond & McCroskey, 1985). The person who is highly apprehensive would be expected to show fewer positive immediacy behaviors because of his/her dislike (affect) and fear of communication situations.

The person who uses more immediate behaviors will be preceived by others as more likeable, friendly, and generally attractive (McCroskey, Richmond, & Stewart, 1986; Richmond & McCroskey, 1985), and evidence has demostrated that students who are perceived as more attractive are evaluated more positively that those who are perceived as less attractive (Foster, Peason, & Imahori, 1984). Those who are highly communication apprehensive are viewed as less attractive (Richmond & McCroskey, 1985). It

therefore seems logical that immediacy of students like CA would be a factor in the evaluation of students.

Students' perceptions of instructor immediacy have been a strong predictor of affective, but not of cognitive learning (Andersen, 1979; Andersen & Withrow, 1981; Andersen, Norton, & Nussbaum, 1981; Kearney, Plax, & Wendt-Wasco, 1985). However, teachers and students' perceptions of their own immediacy have not been predictive of affective learning or course evaluations (Allen, Long, & O'Mara, 1985; Rodgers & McCroskey, 1984)

Some past studies have found reports of CA and self-immediacy to be generally positively correlated. Those experiencing high CA and who are nonimmediate perceived that they had more communication problems and suffered more negative consequences (Allen, Richmond, McCroskey, 1984; Richmond, McCroskey, Balwin, & Berger, 1984). Allen and O'Mara (1985) reported that nonnative English speakers studying in the U.S. were significantly less immediate when communicating with American students, teachers, and the general public than when communicating with their countrymen, and as CA went up when speaking in English, immediacy was lower.

In its report on the education of international students in the U.S., the Institute of International Education (Goodwin & Nacht, 1983) noted that U.S. faculty show apathy, hostility, and annoyance toward foreign students.

> Many faculty used terms such as "inscrutable" to describe students from abroad and professed an inability to penetrate a degree of reserve far less common among U.S. students. (p. 10)

U.S. faculty believe international students to be less "immediate" and confess to being "nonimmediate" with them. Students and those in the communities where nonnative English speakers attend school are reported to show "mixed" approach/avoidance behaviors. **The second specific purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between nonnative English speaking students' immediacy, generally and in generalized contexts, and 1) the amount of CA experienced, and 2) the affective, cognitive, and behavioral outcomes in U.S. classrooms.**

Communication Competency

Given the "learned helplessness" explanation of the development, it would be expected that CA in a second language would be higher than in one's native, first language. It is suggested that individuals learn to feel anxious when expectaions of succeeding in situations are not reinforced, and they come to perceive little control over their fate (Richmond & McCroskey, 1985). The speculation would be that those to whom English is a second language would find many modes of communicating in the U.S. ego-threatening. If attempts to communicate in the second language are not positively reinforced, and they will not likely be when the individual is a bilingual, nonnative English speaker in the U.S., the individual's affective theshold relative to communicating are likely to be lowered culminating in heightened

anxiety, withdrawal, less practice in the second language, and a vicious circle of failure and avoidance when communicaing in English (Krashen, 1981; Lucas, 1984).

A certain amount of such anxiety may be overcome by increasing the individual's competency as a communicator, but there is probably a limit to how much the individual who is highly CA is going to be helped by English as a Second Language Programs (ESL). Such programs are generally based on the grammar-translation method of teaching, and are predicated on the idea that by increasing one's knowledge of a language, and providing increased practice time under controlled conditions, the ability to function in a second language is achieved. This expectation does not seem realistic in light of research findings relative to communication effectiveness and CA.

Previous studies have found a modest correlation between CA and proficiency in a person's native, first language. This relationship has been slightly stronger when communicating in a second language where proficiency is generally lower. This has been taken to mean that a lack of proficiency in a second language may account for a modest increase in CA and communication avoidance. It is likely that CA and proficiency are unrelated once some moderate level of proficiency is reached. This is supported by the fact that CA continues to be a major explanation of communication avoidance in a person's native language, even though the relationship between CA and proficiency is slight (Fayer, et al., 1984; McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985;

McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986). A study of students assigned to special classes at a U.S. university because of their of deficient language skills reported no higher CA than students in regualar university classes (Allen, Andriate, & Cusick, 1982; Andriate & Allen, 1984). In another study no relationship was found between CA and the number of years nonnative English speakers had spoken English or lived in the U.S.(Allen, et al., 1986), and Applbaum and Trotter (1986) found that Hispanic Americans' avoidance behaviors in both English and Spanish were more related to CA than proficiency.

By acquiring additional knowledge about language and communication, receiving training in communication skills, and getting practice, it is possible that CA in a second language may be reduced to somewhat. It is highly unlikely, however, that it will be reduced lower than CA in the first language. It seems that CA in the first language is the basis for the minimal level of CA which can be expected in the second language. There is a point beyond which additional competence and skill development will not result in lower CA unless some effort is made to reduce the CA experienced in the first language. Much communication avoidance is simply not the result of lack of competency and skill in communication, and vice versa (McCroskey, 1984; McCroskey, Gudykunst, & Nishida, 1985)

It has been observed that many of the problems in and out of the classroom experienced by nonnative English speakers in the U.S. are related to lack of effectiveness when communicating in

English. Therefore, **another purpose of this study was to further examine the relationship among nonnative English speakers' CA, immediacy, and self-reported communication competency, and to determine if these variables affect cognitive affective, behavioral outcomes of learning.**

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions were examined:

1. Are there relationships among nonnative English speakers' self-reports of communication apprehension, immediacy, and competency when communicating in their native language?

2. Are there relationships among nonnative English speakers' self-reports of communication apprehension, immediacy, competency, and learning outcomes--cognitive, affective, and behavioral--when communicating in English?

3. Do nonnative English speakers who are high communication apprehensives when communicating in their native language differ from either moderate or low communication apprehensives in terms of general immediacy reported?

4. Do nonnative English speakers who are high communication apprehensives when communicating in English differ from either moderate or low communication apprehensives in terms of immediacy reported with Americans generally and in varying contexts?

5. Do nonnative English speakers who are high apprehensives differ from either moderate or low apprehensives in terms of their self-reports of communication competency in either their native language or English?

6. Do nonnative English speakers who are high apprehensives when communicating in English differ from either moderate or low apprehensives in terms of learning outcomes--cognitive, affective, and behavioral?

METHODS

Two versions of the Personal Report of Communication (PRCA-24) (McCroskey, 1986) were administered to 298 international students from 55 countries, attending a medium-sized, private university in the northeastern United States. One version of the PRCA-24 was administered to assess feelings of communication apprehension associated wilth speaking in the subjects' native language. Another version assessed feelings of apprehension associated with speaking English. Both versions of the PRCA-24 were administered in English, and the order of administering the two versions was alternated so as to avoid an order effect. There is substantial normative data available for this self-report instrument. Data from over 25,000 subjects indicates a mean of 65.6 and a standard deviation of 15.3 , and high reliabililty and predictive validity (McCroskey, 1984; McCroskey & Beatty, 1984). In this study alpha reliabilities for the PRCA-24 were .87 when measuring CA in subjects' first languages, and .89 when measuring CA in English

Nonverbal immediacy was measured by four likert-type scales. After reading a definition of nonverbal immediacy, students were asked to indicate on scales ranging from one to seven (one being highly immediate; 7 being lowly immediate) the extent of their immediacy when communicating in their native language generally, with Americans generally, with American students, and with university instructors.

Competency in oral communication was also assessed by two Likert-Type scales. Subjects were asked to rate themselves from one to five (one being very poor and five being exceptionally good) in terms of their oral communication generally in both their native language and English.

Affective learning was measured by semantic differential scales, with a range from one to seven spaces. The scales were designed to measure student affect toward the communication practices suggested in the course, toward the content of the course, toward the course instructor, and toward the course in general. These scales have yielded high reliability in previous studies (Andersen, 1979; Andersen, Norton, & Nussbaum, 1981; Kearney, et al., 1985). The alpha coefficients in this investigation were .66 for communication practices, .64 for content, .85 for instructor, and .72 for the course in general.

Behavioral intent was assessed by seven space semantic differential scales on the likelihood of actually attempting to engage in the communication practices suggested in the course, and the likelihood of actually enrolling in another course of related content. Once again, previous studies have revealed these to be highly reliable. The alpha coefficients of reliability in this study were .90 for the likelihood of engaging in the communication practices, and .83 for the likelihood of enrolling in another course of similar content.

Previous studies of learning outcomes have indicated that it is very difficult to determine an efficacious measure of cognitive learning. The use of final grades has been criticised because of the degree of variation from instructor to instructor, and tests are often not an indication of what was actually taught. In this study it was decided to use students' predictions of their final grade as a criterion variable of cognitive learning. It was reasoned that students will make such a prediction mostly on the basis of their feeling about learning, and that if a student feels he/she learned a certain amount that becomes his/her measure of cognitive learning, regardless of, or in spite of, the final grade assigned by the instructor.

The PRCA-24 and communication competency scale were administered during the first week of the semester before there could be contamination because of material covered in classes. Scales measuring immediacy and learning outcomes were administered during the final week of the semester, so that students had ample experience with target individuals and content.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows a strong correlation (.70) between CA in native language and CA in English. Moderate correlations

were found among immediacy when subjects' were communicating in their native language, and when they were communicating in English with Americans generally (.37), with American students (.35) and with American university instructors (.35). When communicating in English, there are strong correlations among immediacy with Americans generally and immediacy with American university students (.79), and with instructors in the U.S, (.66). Immediacy with U.S. students is strongly correlated with immediacy with instructors (.68). It can be concluded that both CA and immediacy are general traits which can be generalized to both native language and English. Those who are highly apprehensive when communicating in their native language are likely to experience high apprehension when communicating in English, and the tendency to be lowly immediate when communicating in one's native language is likely to be problematic across specific situations when communicating in English.

Research question one was examined by computing Pearson correlation coefficients among CA, immediacy, and communication competency when subjects were speaking in their native language. Table 1 reveals low, but fairly significant correlation between CA in one's native language and competency in that language (.22, $p<.001$), and a slightly lower, but significant correlation of CA and immediacy in one's native culture (.19, p,.01). A .18 correlation existed between native language competency and

immediacy. The relationships among CA, immediacy and competency in subjects' native language was positive, but slight.

Interestingly, when analyzing research question two stonger relationships were found between CA in English and self perceptions of competency when communicating in English (.35). Similar findings in previous studies have been interpreted to mean that lack of proficiency in English may explain much of the increase in CA when communicating in English. Low proficiency in a second language may lead to big increases in the amount of CA in the a second language, but it is speculated, given the low relationship between CA and competency in the native language, that increased competence in English would not reduce CA past the baseline established in the native language. CA in the first language appears to establish a baseline for CA in the second language (McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985; McCroskey, Gudykunst, & Nishia, 1985).

When communicating in English, a modest relationship was found among CA and immediacy with Americans generally (.23), university students (.18), and instructors (.24). Like CA and competency, the correlation between immediacy and competency was stronger when English was the mode of communication. Immediacy with Americans generally and English competency were correlated at .36; immediacy with

university students correlated with English competency at .37; and immediacy with instructors correlated with immediacy at .31. Just as CA increases becuase of lack of proficiency in English, immediacy is much lower because of lack of English proficiency. It should be noted, that the relationship between immediacy and competency is stronger in both the subjects' native language and in English, than is the relationship between CA and immediacy.

Significant correlations were found between CA in English and affect for the instructor (.20), and CA and behavioral intent (.23). However, CA was not significantly correlated with other affective, cognitive, and behavioral learning outcomes. Neither competency or immediacy in English was significantly related to learning outcomes. In passing, it is interesting to note that immediacy when communicating in one's native language was significantly correlated with liking the course (.24), and behavioral intent (.21). Perhaps there is a cultural aspect to immediacy that presupposes attitudes toward a basic communication course.

It can be seen by examining Table 2, high CAs are significantly less immediate when communicating in their native language than are low CAs ($F=3.10$, $p<.05$). Low and moderate CAs did not differ in terms of immediacy in their native language. So even though the correlation between

immediacy and CA in the research population generally was modest, CA is a more important consideration in predicting the immediacy of those who are high in CA.

Table 2 also indicates that high CAs were less differed immediate with Americans generally than were either moderate or low CAs ($F=5.433$, $p<.005$). Moerate and low CAs did not differ in terms of immediacy with Americans generally. In a specific context, high CAs were less immediate with university students than moderate or low CAs ($F=3.55$, $p<.03$). It seems high CAs have problems in communicating which go beyond cultural differences. However, no significant differences were found in immediacy with instructors. If is noteworthy that the immediacy mean for low CAs shot way up, indicating less immediacy, when communicating with instructors.

Significant differences in competency were found among high, moderate, and low CAs when communicating in both their native language ($F=24.47$, $p<.0001$) and English ($F=5.52$, $p<.005$). Level of CA certainly affects the strength with which bilingual communicators report competence in communication.

When it came to learning outcomes, high and moderate CAs indicated less liking for the practices and skills taught than did low CAs ($F=4.27$, $p<.02$). Increasing amounts

of CA definitely impact affect for communication practices recommended in the course. Moreover, there was no significant difference among high, moderate, and low CAs when it came to affect for course content, suggesting that nonnative English speakers don't mind studying the comtent of the communication course, but they do not like putting it into practice. No differences were found in terms of affect for the instructor or the course in general. Likewise, no differences were found in terms predicted grade--the cognitive learning variable--or the indices of behavioral learning.

REFERENCES

Allen, J.L. (1984). Gender, communication competence, apprehension and the basic skills course. Paper presented at the Annual Communication, Language, and Gender Conference, Miami University, Oxford, OH.

Allen, J.L. & Andriate,G.S. (1984). Communication apprehension in bilingual non-native U.S. residents. Communication,13, 39-49.

Allen, J.L., Andriate, G.S. & Cusick, R. (1982). A comparison of communication apprehension in basic studies and non-basic studies students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Hartford, CT.

Allen, J.L. & O'Mara, J. (1985). Nonverbal immediacy and communication apprehension by international students studying in the U.S. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Eastern Communication Association, Providence, RI.

Allen, J.L., Richmond, V.P. & McCroskey, J.C. (1984a). Communication and the chiropractic profession I. Journal of Chiropractic, 21,25-30.

Allen, J.L., Richmond, V.P. & McCroskey, J.C. (1984b). Communication and the chiropractic profession II. Journal of Chiropractic,21, 46-50.

Allen, J.L., Richmond, V.P. & McCroskey, J.C. (1984c). Communication and the chiropractic profession III. Journal of Chiropractic,21, 36-38.

Allen,J.L., Long, K.M. & O'Mara, J. (1985). Communiciation apprehension, generalized and contextual immediacy and achievement in the basic course. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.

Allen,J.L., O'Mara,J. & Andriate,G.S. (1986). Communication apprehension in bilingual nonnative U.S. residents II: Gender, second language experience, and communication apprehension in functional contexts. World Communication (in press).

Allen,J.L., O'Mara,J. & Judd,B. (1985). The relationship of communication anxiety, avoidance, and competence of nonnative English speakers in the U.S. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Honolulu, HI.

Andersen,J.F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 3. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Andersen, J.F. & Withrow, J.G. (1981). The impact of lecturer nonverbal expressiveness on improving mediated instruction. Communication Education, 30, 342-353.

Andersen, J.F., Norton, R.W. & Nussbaum, J.F. (1981). Three investigations exploring relationships between perceived teacher communication behaviors and student learning. Communication Education, 30, 377-392 .

Andriate, G.S. & Allen, J.L. (1984). Communiciation apprehension in underprepared versus traditional college students. Communication Research Reports, 1, 68-72.

Applebaum, R.L. & Trotter,II, R.T. (1986). Communiciation apprehension and hispanics: An exploration of communication apprehension among Mexican Americans. Paper to be presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communiciation Association, Chicago, IL.

Bashore, D.N. (1971). Relationship among speech anxiety, IQ, and high school achievement. Illinois State University: Unpublished thesis.

Fayer, J.M., McCroskey, J.C. & Richmond, V.P. (1984). Communication apprehension in Puerto Rico and the United States I: Initial comparisons. Communication 13, 49-66.

Foster, T.J., Pearson, J.C. & Imahori, T. (1984). Pulchritude, peers and performance: The effects of initial and final public speaking performance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Goodwin, C.D. & Nacht, M. (1983). Absence of decision: Foreign students in American colleges and universities. New York: Institute of International Education.

Hurt, T.H. & Preiss, R. (1978). Silence isn't necessarily golden: Communication apprehension, desired social choice and academic success among middle-school students. Human Communication Research, 4, 314-318.

Kearney, P., Plax, T.G. & Wendt-Wasco, N.J. (1985). Teacher immediacy for affective learning in divergent college classes. Communication Quarterly,33,61-74.

Klopf, D.W. (1984). Cross-cultural apprehension research: A summary of pacific basin studies. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lucas, J. (1984). Communication apprehension in the ESL classroom: Getting our students to talk. Foreign Language Annals, 17, 593-598.

McCroskey, J.C. (1977a). Classroom consequences of communication apprehension. Communication Education,26,27-33.

McCroskey, J.C. (1984). The communication apprehensive perspective. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: shyness, reticence and communication apprehension. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J.C. (1986). An introduction to rhetorical communication (4th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs,NJ: Prentice Hall.

McCroskey, J.C. (1982). Oral communication apprehension: A reconceptualization. In M. Burgoon, (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 6, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J.C. (1977b). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research,4, 78-96.

McCroskey, J.C. & Beatty, M.J. (1984). Communiciation apprehension and accumulated state anxiety experience. Communication Monographs,51, 79-84.

McCroskey, J.C. & McCroskey, L.L. (1986). Communication competence and willingness to communicate. Paper to be presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

McCroskey,J.C. & Andersen, J.F. (1976). The relationship between communication apprehension and academic achievement among college students. Human Communication Research, 3, 73-81.

McCroskey, J.C. & Daly, J.A. (1976). Teachers' exjpectations of the communication apprehensive child. Human Communication Researach,3, 67-72.

McCroskey, J.C., Gudykunst, W.B. & Nishida, T. (1985). Communication apprehension among Japanese students in native and second language. Communication Research Reports, 2, 11-16.

McCroskey, J.C., Fayer, J.M. & Richmond, V.P. (1985). Don't speak to me in English: Communiciation apprehension among Puerto Rican students. Communication Quarterly, 33, 185-192.

McKCroskey, J.C., Richmond, V.P. & Stewart, R.A. (1986). One on one: The foundations of interpersonal communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). Silent Messages. Belmont,CA: Wadsworth.

Payne,S.K. & Richmond,V.P. (1984). Communication avoidance: A bibliography of research and writing on communication apprehension, reticence, and shyness. In J. Daly & J.McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension. Beverly Hills,CA: Sage.

Powers, W. & Smythe, M.J. (1980). Communication apprehension and achievement in a performance-oriented basic communication course. Human Communication Research,6,146-152.

Richmond,V.P. (1984). Implications of quietness: Some facts and speculations. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Richmond,V.P. & McCroskey,J.C. (1985). Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness. Scottsdale,AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Richmond,V.P. & Andriate,G.S. (1984). Communication apprehension: Cross-cultural perspectives. Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association convention, Philadelphia,PA.

Richmond, V.P., McCroskey,J.C., Baldwin,H.J. & Berger,B. (1984). Immediacy of pharmacy students in 52 colleges of pharmacy in the United States. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia,PA.

Rodgers,M.A. & McCroskey,J.C. (1984). Nonverbal immediacy of teachers in classroom environments. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Scott,M.S. & Wheeless, L.R. (1977). Communication apprehension, student attitudes and levels of satisfaction. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 41, 188-199.

Zimbardo, P,G. (1977). Shyness: What it is and what to do about it. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Table 1

Correlation among CA, Immediacy, Competency, and Learning Variables for Nonnative English Speakers

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Native Language CA	.70	.33	.22	.19	.23	.18	.24	.19	.10	.18	.21	.21	.09	.04
2. English CA		.17	.35	.04	.26	.21	.17	.07	.05	.20	.11	.23	.10	.09
3. Native Language Competency			.17	.18	.03	.01	.11	.08	.06	.07	.09	.08	.05	.07
4. English Competency				.03	.36	.37	.31	.11	.10	.002	.13	.08	.16	.05
5. Native Immediacy					.37	.35	.35	.30	.23	.12	.24	.21	.05	.06
6. Gen. American. Immediacy						.79	.66	.11	.07	.12	.02	.04	.02	.07
7. Student Immediacy							.68	.22	.22	.009	.11	.10	.04	.04
8. Instructor Immediacy								.21	.24	.10	.09	.005	.02	.11
9. Affect, Comm. Practice									.83	.38	.76	.41	.16	-.09
10. Affect, Course Content										.37	.75	.36	.16	-.05
11. Affect, Instructor											.74	.75	.30	-.17
12. Affect, Course in general												.76	.62	-.20
13. Behavioral Intent, engaging in practice													.41	-.14
14. Behavioral Intent, enrolling in course														-.24
15. Expected Grade														

Correlations below .12 were not statistically significant ($p > .05$).
Correlations > .12 and < .16 were statistically significant at $p < .05$.
Correlations > .15 and < .20 were statistically significant at $p < .01$.
Correlations >.20 were statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Table 2

Means for Immediacy, Communication Competency, and Learning Outcomes by Levels of Communication Apprehension Experienced

Language	-Communication Apprehension Levels- High CA (PRCA>79)	Moderate CA (PRCA>51 &,80)	Low CA (PRCA<52)
Native	(n=51)	(n=190)	(n=57)
General Immediacy	2.91[a]	2.69	2.29[a]
Communication Competency	3.43[a]	3.86[b]	4.46[a,b]
English	(n=70)	(n=186)	(n=42)
Imm. w/ Amer. Generally	3.89[a,b]	3.43a	3.20[b]
Imm. w/ Amer. Students	3.77[a,b]	3.35[a]	3.28[b]
Imm. w/ Univ. Instructors	3.97	3.29	3.90
Communication Competency	2.80a	2.97b	3.37[a,b]
Aff-Com. Prac.	23.11[a]	21.75[b]	25.80[a,b]
Aff-Content	23.22	22.17	24.10
Aff-Instrutor	23.19	23.96	25.90
Aff-General	112.69	112.96	121.10
Predicted Grade	2.32	2.14	2.00
Engag. Behavior	25.97	26.38	27.30
Enroll. Course.	17.19	18.65	18.00

Matching letters in the same row are significantly different at $p<.05$.